



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,678	03/18/2004	Pekka Ketola	915-005.099	8566

10945 7590 01/03/2011

NOKIA CORPORATION
c/o Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP
Building Five, Bradford Green
755 Main Street, PO Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468

EXAMINER

ALVESTEFFER, STEPHEN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/03/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/805,678	KETOLA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen Alvesteffer	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-16,18-30,33-36 and 38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-16,18-30,33-36 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is responsive to the Response filed October 21, 2010. No claims are amended. Claims 4, 17, 31, 32, 37, and 39 are previously cancelled. Claims 1, 15, and 30 are independent. Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-30, 33-36, and 38 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-30, 33, 34, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al. (hereinafter Bennett), United States Patent

Art Unit: 2175

Application Publication 2002/0194379, and Bates et al. (hereinafter Bates), United States Patent 6,735,347.

Regarding claim 1, Bennett substantially teaches a method comprising:

automatically tracing a latest operation relating to at least one source application using a tracing application, wherein the at least one source application and the tracing application are located on a device (see Bennett paragraph [0026], “*systems and methods utilize processes that identify information in source documents, extract data representing the identified information, and produce a structured template with the extracted data. The extracted information may then be used in a variety of ways. It may be used to categorize or assign relevance to the source documents. Also, the user device may be programmed to automatically integrate all or part of the extracted information with other applications operating on the device*”),

extracting at least one item from the traced operation (see Bennett paragraph [0087], “*if a source is received along with an indication of its type, for example, a task item, the process of extracting type-specific data from the source may be simplified significantly*”),

automatically recording the at least one extracted item into a list of recorded items in a file of the tracing application, said recorded item list comprising recorded items extracted from traced operations of various source applications, the file comprising items of different media types (Bates, addressed below) and the file being located on said device (see Bennett paragraph [0047], “*The client 100 comprises an organizer 210 with task, calendar, and contact components, 210a, 210b, and 210c,*

Art Unit: 2175

respectively. Those skilled in the art will recognize that task component 210a of organizer 210 stores and manages information concerning tasks (e.g., "to do" items), the calendar component 210b stores and manages information concerning time-related events (e.g., meetings, conferences, deadlines, etc.), and contact component 210c stores and manages information concerning contacts (e.g., name, address, telephone number, fax number, etc.)."),

presenting, upon the tracing application being called by at least one target application located on said device, the recorded item list of the tracing application to the at least one target application to allow for user-selection of one or more recorded items from the list (see Bennett paragraph [0083], *"the event extraction process automatically identifies a message as requiring action and identifies those sentences or phrases that detail the action to be taken and/or any deadlines associated with taking the action. Extracted information is represented in XML. A to-do list update program takes this information, suggests to-do updates to the users of the to-do list software, and allows them to confirm or reject the suggestion."*); and

providing the one or more user-selected items to the at least one target application (see Bennett paragraph [0083], *"A to-do list update program takes this information, suggests to-do updates to the users of the to-do list software, and allows them to confirm or reject the suggestion."*).

Bennett teaches every limitation of claim 1 except that the file comprises items of different media types. Bennett only teaches that textual information is extracted. Bates teaches extracting both images and text and storing both media types in the clipboard

Art Unit: 2175

for pasting into different applications (see Bates column 3 line 44 through column 4 line 4; “*Preferably, the text extractor 226, intelligent pasting agent 228 and image editor 229 are implemented system wide such that images can be copied from a document in one application and then intelligently pasted into a new document in a second application. For example, an image can be copied from a word processor, and the extracted text pasted into a text only field viewed on a web browser*”). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow extraction of media types other than text as taught by Bates in the text extraction invention of Bennett in order to allow integration with a wider variety of application types. Bennett suggests using at least image data as source content in paragraph [0029], “*In this application the term "text" refers to any type of data used to convey information. Character-based languages, such as English, French, Chinese, and Japanese convey information using characters or combinations of characters. However, graphic images also convey information, and they may be structured or unstructured. For example, an icon on a display screen may include a combination of characters and graphics that convey to the viewer information on the application, file, or data represented by the icon*”.

Regarding claim 2, Bennett/Bates teaches that the item is selected from the file by means of a clipboard (see Bates column 5 lines 10-24; “*The selected data is then copied into the memory buffer for this purpose, sometimes referred to as a "clipboard."*”).

Regarding claim 3, Bennett/Bates teaches that more than one operations is traced and recorded (see Bennett paragraphs [0082-0083], “*the event extraction process automatically identifies and extracts new phone/fax/cell phone numbers, email addresses, etc. from email... In still another example, the event extraction process automatically identifies and extracts time-critical events from textual materials such as research reports, news release, newspaper articles, etc.*”).

Regarding claim 5, Bennett/Bates teaches that the file is a log file (a clipboard as taught by Bates is a specific type of log file).

Regarding claim 6, Bennett/Bates teaches that the tracing comprises automatically tracing at least one of the following operations: handling, receiving, sending, downloading, creating, and deleting (see Bennett paragraphs [0082-0083], “*the event extraction process automatically identifies and extracts new phone/fax/cell phone numbers, email addresses, etc. from email*”).

Regarding claim 7, Bennett/Bates teaches that said extracted item is a content of the operation or a property of the operation (see Bennett paragraphs [0082-0083], “*the event extraction process automatically identifies and extracts new phone/fax/cell phone numbers, email addresses, etc. from email*”).

Regarding claim 8, Bennett/Bates teaches that the at least one source application and the at least one target application are located within one application program (see Bennett paragraph [0047], “*The client 100 comprises an organizer 210 with task, calendar, and contact components, 210a, 210b, and 210c, respectively.*”; see also Bennett paragraph [0057], “*Those skilled in the art will recognize that certain*

architectures consistent with the present invention may provide for clients that do not have resident applications but instead communicate with servers that manage applications and/or application data for the clients. For example, a client device may communicate with a server that maintains a calendar for a user associated with the client device. In such a configuration, the client device may be prompted to update the calendar located on the server.”; In one embodiment, several components are integrated into one application, with the source and target residing on the server device).

Regarding claim 9, Bennett/Bates teaches that the at least one source application and the at least one target application are located in different application programs (see Bennett paragraph [0026], “*the user device may be programmed to automatically integrate all or part of the extracted information with other applications operating on the device*”).

Regarding claim 10, Bennett/Bates teaches that the at least one source application and the at least one target application are located in different devices (see Bennett paragraph [0040], “*The facility obtains the user's email from, for example, a mail server associated with the user's email account. The facility parses the email for structure and content of the body using various filters. The parsed content is then presented to a rule-based system that invokes various processes to process the email. One such process automatically identifies information in unstructured text of the email message and extracts data representing, for example, an event to produce a structured template with the extracted data. The facility then delivers the structured data to the*

Art Unit: 2175

web-enabled cellular telephone for further action. In the case of an event, the facility may also prompt the user to update a calendar associated with the user's organizer to reflect the event. For example, if the event is a new meeting, the user's calendar is updated to include the meeting.”).

Regarding claim 11, Bennett/Bates teaches that said file of the tracing application is shared between application programs of a computing device (see Bennett paragraph [0026], *“the user device may be programmed to automatically integrate all or part of the extracted information with other applications operating on the device”*).

Regarding claim 12, Bennett/Bates teaches that the method comprises identifying a media type of the item (see Bates column 3 line 44 through column 4 line 4; *“The extracted text can then be pasted into the destination document as text. Thus, textual information from an image can easily and automatically be copied into text portions of the destination document. Alternatively, the image with the text removed can be copied into the destination in one cut and paste operation”*).

Regarding claim 13, Bennett/Bates teaches that said media type belongs to one of the following groups: image, audio, video, text, uniform resource location, phonebook entry, music, calendar event, wallet and error message (see Bennett paragraph [0029], *“Systems and methods consistent with the present invention may operate on any form of source material, including structured text, unstructured text, or a combination of both”*).

Regarding claim 14, Bennett/Bates teaches that the method comprises classifying the item based on the identified media type of the item (see Bates column 3

line 44 through column 4 line 4; *“The extracted text can then be pasted into the destination document as text. Thus, textual information from an image can easily and automatically be copied into text portions of the destination document. Alternatively, the image with the text removed can be copied into the destination in one cut and paste operation”*).

Claims 15, 16, and 18-25 recite a device with substantially the same limitations as the method of claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-14. Therefore, the claims are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 26, Bennett/Bates teaches that said latest operation to be traced is implemented without user action (see Bennett paragraph [0040], *“One such process automatically identifies information in unstructured text of the email message and extracts data representing, for example, an event to produce a structured template with the extracted data. The facility then delivers the structured data to the web-enabled cellular telephone for further action”*).

Regarding claim 27, Bennett/Bates teaches that the device is further configured to allow for manual tracing of operations of the at least one source application (see Bennett paragraph [0087], *“in one alternative configuration, each source may be reviewed or pre-processed, either automatically or manually, to determine its type, or the provider of each source may designate a source's type”*).

Regarding claim 28, Bennett/Bates teaches that the device is further configured for mobile communication (see Bennett paragraph [0028], *“Consistent with the present invention, the user devices at least receive data but they may also transmit and receive*

Art Unit: 2175

data. The users devices may be wireless or wired devices. A large variety of different types of users devices may be adapted for use in connection with systems and methods consistent with the present invention. A non-limiting list of user devices includes any type of computer, any type of personal digital assistant (PDA), and any type of device configured in accordance with standards used to configure computers, PDAs, and wireless (such as cellular and satellite) telephones for communicating data”).

Claim 29 recites a system for implementing the method of claim 1. Therefore, claim 29 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Claims 30 and 33 recite a computer program product with substantially the same limitations as the method of claim 1. Therefore, the claims are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 34, Bennett/Bates teaches that a media type of said item belongs to one of the following groups: image, audio, video (see Bates column 3 line 44 through column 4 line 4; “*The extracted text can then be pasted into the destination document as text. Thus, textual information from an image can easily and automatically be copied into text portions of the destination document. Alternatively, the image with the text removed can be copied into the destination in one cut and paste operation*”).

Regarding claim 38, Bennett/Bates teaches that said traced operation is one or more of: a phone call, and for which said item is a phone number; a camera shot, and for which said item is an image; and a site downloaded from a network, and for which said item is the URL of the site (see Bennett paragraphs [0082-0083], “*the event*

Art Unit: 2175

extraction process automatically identifies and extracts new phone/fax/cell phone numbers, email addresses, etc. from email").

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett (US 2002/0194379) *supra*, Bates (6,005,928) *supra*, and Goh et al. (hereinafter Goh), United States Patent Application 2006/0155811.

Regarding claim 35, Bennett/Bates teaches every limitation of claim 35, but does not explicitly teach that said at least one target application is a multimedia messaging service message. Goh teaches a clipboard system for mobile devices that makes use of Multimedia Messaging Service (MMS) (see Goh paragraph [0053]; *"The example embodiment further comprises file conversion techniques for the user to convert an attached file in a received email to an image file format or text format. For example, the resultant image file can be viewed via Multimedia Messaging Service (MMS), while the resultant text can be viewed via WAP"*). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make use of MMS technology as taught by Goh in the invention of Bennett/Bates. Bennett teaches operating the invention using mobile devices similar to those used in Goh's invention (see Bennett paragraph [0028], *"Consistent with the present invention, the user devices at least receive data but they may also transmit and receive data. The users devices may be wireless or wired devices. A large variety of different types of users devices may be adapted for use in connection with systems and methods consistent with the present invention. A non-limiting list of user devices includes any type of computer, any type of*

Art Unit: 2175

personal digital assistant (PDA), and any type of device configured in accordance with standards used to configure computers, PDAs, and wireless (such as cellular and satellite) telephones for communicating data”)

Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett (US 2002/0194379) *supra*, Bates (6,005,928) *supra*, and Kumar, United States Patent Application 2005/0028008.

Regarding claim 36, Bennett/Bates teaches every limitation of claim 36 except that the method further comprises presenting said recorded item list utilizing a check-box feature for user-selection. Kumar teaches utilizing a check-box feature for selecting files to paste from a clipboard (see Kumar paragraph [0114]; “*Paste File(s) from Clipboard: This function allows the user to paste or insert all the selected files (via checkbox) to the selected Folder*”). Both Kumar and Bennett/Bates utilize a clipboard for pasting multiple items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a check-box feature for selecting files to paste as taught by Kumar in the invention of Bennett/Bates to provide a standard way of selecting several items at once.

Response to Arguments

Applicant asserts that Bennett does not discuss that a user can “call” a tracing application in order to allow provision of one or more items upon user instruction.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant provides an example alleging deficiencies in Bennett, "*Without such a callable tracing application, it is respectfully submitted that a user of a device in accordance with the teaching of Bennett could not create an MMS message based on a previously viewed image*" (Response, page 4). However, examiner notes that applicant is reading a much narrower interpretation of the claim language into the claims. The independent claims do not require that a user be able to call a tracing application in order to allow provision of one or more items upon user instruction. The independent claims only require that the tracing application may be called by a target application, which Bennett provides for (see Bennett paragraph [0012], "*there is a need to provide a users with the ability to easily sort and categorize information in email messages, web pages, and the like, and to **integrate** (either automatically or **on demand**) **selected information with other applications***," emphasis added). Furthermore, the independent claims do not recite copying, pasting, MMS, or extracting images. Instead of reciting "copying" and "pasting", the independent claims only recite "recording" and "providing", which can reasonably be interpreted very broadly in the computer arts. Instead of creating an MMS message based on a previously viewed image, the independent claims only recite providing a recorded item to a target application. Again, "providing a recorded item to a target application" can reasonably be interpreted very broadly in the computer arts.

Bennett and Bates are believed to reasonably teach every limitation of the independent claims as recited. Specifically, applicant asserts that the limitation "*presenting, upon the tracing application being called by at least one target application*

Art Unit: 2175

located on said device, the recorded item list of the tracing application to the at least one target application to allow for user-selection of one or more recorded items from the list" is not taught by Bennett or the combination of Bennett and Bates. Bennett teaches extracting information from various sources such as email messages or web pages that the user is viewing (see Bennett paragraph [0012], "*there is a need to provide a users with the ability to easily sort and categorize information in email messages, web pages, and the like, and to integrate (either automatically or on demand) selected information with other applications.*"), then storing that information into templates for later use (see Bennett paragraph [0035], "*Systems and methods consistent with the present invention may utilize multiple types of templates, one for each type of information identified in a source. Consequently, such systems and methods may populate an event information template with data concerning an event extracted from a source, a contact information template with data concerning a contact (e.g., name, address, telephone number, etc.) extracted from a source, and a task information template with data concerning a task extracted from a source, etc*"). The user may then be presented the list of recorded items to allow for selection of one or more items to be integrated with the user's calendar, address book, to-do list, or the like (see Bennett paragraph [0036], "*After the information is extracted from an email, for example, the user may be prompted to instruct the user's device to cause a separate software application, such as an organizer, to update the user's calendar, address book, or task (to-do) list*"). Therefore, Bennett is still seen as teaching "*presenting, upon the tracing application being called by at least one target application located on said device, the recorded item list of the*

Art Unit: 2175

tracing application to the at least one target application to allow for user-selection of one or more recorded items from the list”.

Applicant asserts that Bennett could not have been combined with Bates to arrive at the features of the instant recited claims because a person of ordinary skill in the art would have to abandon the manual saving or automatic share/integration aspects of Bates or Bennett respectively, which would negate the benefits associated with each of these documents. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Bates is relied upon only for its explicit teaching that different media types other than text may be stored for integration into other applications. Bennett teaches every limitation of the independent claims, but does not explicitly teach extracting and storing any information other than textual information. Bates shows that it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made to also extract and store images for later integration with other applications.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Lee (US 5,504,805) Calling number identification using speech recognition
- O'Hara et al. (US 2002/0178222) Information duplication and customization system and method for handheld computers

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Alvesteffer whose telephone number is (571)270-1295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571)272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2175

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Stephen Alvesteffer
Examiner
Art Unit 2175

/S. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/William L. Bashore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175